

In the Drawings:

The attached drawing sheets include changes to Figs. 8 and 9 as well as Fig. 12. These sheets which include Figs. 8, 9 and 12 replace the original sheets including Figs. 8, 9 and 12.

Attachments: Three (3) Replacement Drawing Sheets.

REMARKS**I. Status of the Claims:**

Claims 1-12 are pending in the application.

By this Amendment, claims 6, 7, 9 and 10 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1, 3-5 and 8 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced by this Amendment. Upon entry of this Amendment, claims 1-5, 8, 11 and 12 would be pending.

II. Information Disclosure Statement:

The Examiner indicates that the references (i.e., JPA 2002-174700 and 2002-175980) cited in the Background Section have not been considered. For the Examiner's reference, the references JPA 2002-174700 and 2002-175980 have corresponding U.S. counterparts U.S. Patent No. 6,324,256 and 6,636,367 respectively. The Applicant respectfully submits these references in an IDS for the Examiner's consideration.

III. Drawing Objections:

The drawings have been objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4). Specifically, the Examiner notes that (1) reference characters "14" and "15" have both been used to designate EUV light detector unit and (2) Figure 12 should be labeled --Prior Art--.. To address this issue, Figs. 8 and 9 have been amended to change the reference numeral "14" to --15-- and replacement sheets are submitted herewith.

The Examiner has further indicated that Fig. 12 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art--. However, Fig. 12 has already been labeled with "Prior Art" on the upper-left corner of the sheet in the drawings filed on March 25, 2004. For the Examiner's

convenience, a copy of Fig. 12 is however resubmitted herewith. Approval and entry of the replacement drawing sheets for Figs. 8, 19 and 12 are respectfully requested.

IV. Claim Objections:

Claims 3-7 and 9 are objected to because of some informalities.

Claims 6, 7 and 9 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, rendering this objection moot. Concerning the remaining objected claims 3-5, these claims have been amended to address the Examiner's concerns. Accordingly, withdrawal and reconsideration of the objection are respectfully requested.

V. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶2:

Claims 2, 3, 5 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly the subject matter.

Concerning claims 2 and 3, the Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection and respectfully submits that the claim language at issue would be understood by one of ordinary skill in the art, particularly when read in light of the specification. Examples are described on page 14 and Figure 1, and with respect to the First and Fourth embodiments of the specification in regard to these claims. One of ordinary skill in the art would be apprised of the scope of these claims. See MPEP § 2173.05(b). Accordingly, claims 2, 3 and 5 are believed to be definite.

Concerning claim 8, this claim has been amended and is believed to satisfy the requirements under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of these claims are respectfully requested.

VI. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and § 103:

Claims 1, 7 and 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Berger (US 6,781,135). Claims 2-6, 8 and 12 as being unpatentable over Berger in view of Stuik et al. (Absolute Calibration of a Multilayer-Based XUV Diagnostic, Nuclear Instruments & Methods in Physics research A, Vol. 492, no. 1-2 (11 October 2002), pp. 305-316). The Applicant respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections for the following reasons set forth below.

A. CLAIM 1:

Claim 1, as amended, is directed to an arrangement wherein each of the light intensity detector units is rotatable by approximately 90° while maintaining an incident direction of the light upon the light intensity detector unit.

On the contrary, Berger shows in Fig. 1 that the base 76 of the detector 60 is fixed by the bolts 78 and, thus, is not clearly rotatable. Accordingly, claim 1 and its dependent claims are not anticipated by Berger and are distinguishable over the same.

B. CLAIM 11:

Claim 11 is directed to arrangement in which the light intensity distribution measuring method uses a light intensity detector unit that includes a mirror and a photoelectric conversion element which are arranged so that an incident angle of the light upon the mirror is approximately equal to a Brewster angle for the light. The light intensity distribution measuring method measures the light intensity of the light reflected by the mirror, which light has different directions of polarization by approximately 90° at approximately the same position in the light.

On the contrary, Berger as relied upon by the Examiner simply discusses that “[t]he detector included a single EUV radiation reflective mirror comprising a multilayer Mo/Si film that is tuned to reflect 92.4 eV light at a 45 degree angle.” See col. 5, line 66 to col. 6, line 1 (emphasis added). That is, this cited portion discusses the angle that light is reflected, not the incidence angle of the light upon the mirror. As such, Berger is silent as to an incident angle of the light upon the mirror being approximately equal to a Brewster angle for the light, as claimed. Accordingly, claim 11 and its dependent claims are distinguishable over the cited references.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims and allowance of this application.

AUTHORIZATION

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for consideration of this Amendment to Deposit Account No. 13-4500, Order No. 1232-5358.


In the event that an extension of time is required, or which may be required in addition to that requested in a petition for an extension of time, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to Deposit Account No. 13-4500, Order No. 1232-5358.

Respectfully submitted,
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

Dated: _____

7/14/06

By: _____



James Hyva
Registration No. 42,680
(202) 857-7887 Telephone
(202) 857-7929 Facsimile

Correspondence Address:

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.
3 World Financial Center
New York, NY 10281-2101